

Planning and Zoning for Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations - Summary
Planning Advisory Service Report Number 482, Chapters 1, 2, 4, and 5

Key Planning Issues

Odors

Waste odor composition & transportation characteristics vary by animal type and weather conditions
Storage methods do make a difference (worst-best: lagoons, steel tanks, underground containment)
Spreading methods do make a difference (worst-best: spraying, injection (risk of hill erosion)) (timing)

Air Pollution

Ammonia (deposited up to two miles away, acid rain, excess NH₃ fertilization & soil leaching)
Hydrogen sulfide (rotten egg smell, deadly or debilitating in sufficient concentration)

Water Pollution

Commonly an issue before CAFOs arrive due to fertilizer loadings on cropland
Point source in *catastrophically* dense concentrations and accidents do happen (tourism ↓)

Employment and Displacement

If not a growth industry (e.g. computers) there are inevitably more losers than winners
Losers likely smaller producers
Room for doubt about *net* gain (who benefits?)
Room for doubt about both wage levels and job quality (e.g. immigrant workers, occupational health)

Financial Responsibility

Risk that owner simply walks away from environmental liabilities that exceed property sale gains
Very real possibility of seeing CAFOs become rural “brownfields”, *taxpayers on the hook*
Too high a price to pay for whatever economic development CAFOs may bring
Having to go great lengths to hold the operator accountable
Contractual loop holes shifting responsibility to the “growers” (less deep pockets, bankruptcy)

Political & Social Issues

Social

Family farm activists, communities, & environmentalists feel sacrificed for something
They believe is environmentally irresponsible
They believe *fundamentally alters the character of rural life*. (trappings of industrial life)
Bitter sense of disenfranchisement and anxiety about efficacy of the democratic process
CAFOs are Big Water Consumers (water fights if water table drops)

Political

Irony

Old zoning enabling legislation exempts agriculture from county zoning regulation
Designed not for CAFOs, but to make life easier for family farmers
Livestock industry organizations lobby to retain exemptions
Right-To-Farm laws sought to shield farmers from nuisance lawsuits
So long as farmers were not negligent or violating environmental law
So long as farmers adhered to normal, conventional practices
Constitutionality of Right-To-Farm now in question in case law (takings)
State Officials, relationships in behavior
[↑ latch on idea of maintaining state's market share; ↑ write looser regulation]
[↑ perceive CAFOs as inevitable trend; ↑ lax CAFO regulations & enforcement]
[↑ wanting to attract to somehow benefit rural economy; ↓ questioning value]
Corporate farming restrictions laws prohibiting corporate ownership of farmland
Risks of Relying on State Regulation (gaps, enforcement shortage, never see the actual site)

Comprehensive Plan

Communities must decide *what* they want before they can decide *why* they oppose something

Preservation of their rural character and natural resources, and how to sustain them economically

Need for consensus on Operation Definitions (such as for terms like “rural character”)

Trending concept of “Sustainable Agriculture”

Ban “factory farms” VS. Site CAFOS without local public scrutiny—both must yield ground

The solution may lie in seeking changes in the statutory authority at the state level

Zoning (authority only over future)

Simple enough to enforce but strict enough to be effective (requires realism/extended commitment)

Strategies

Districts

Multitier (gradation) approach to agricultural zoning

Achieve greater separation of residential from heavy agricultural uses

Identifies areas most suitable for and least sensitive to intensive agriculture

Allows for some distribution of feedlot uses (don’t require to haul waste far)

Formulated with a review of current nutrient management plan practices

CAFOs not given an exclusive district

Separation Standards

Incompatible uses due to odor and water pollution

Reasonable diminution of odor plumes under most conducive dispersal downwind

↑ separation requirements; ↑ herd size—is a reasonable regulatory response

Incentive for reduction (qualified agricultural engineer approved means for odor ↓)

Single setback distance (e.g. 500 ft) for spraying of animal waste on sensitive uses

Minimum setbacks & or filter strip plantings for surface water, flood plain, & ditches

Apply setback requirements in reverse to new residential/other development

Conditional Use

Not recommended to list CAFOs as conditional use

temptation to delay establishing clear conditions in the ordinance

fewer surprises, less controversy, and more certainty in the process

Condition permits on the use of best available technologies

And will comply with expectations

state-of-the-art design, placement, & spacing of lagoons is essential

if they to be employed at all (leaks/overflows)

Premium on community welfare over the economic viability of feedlots

Metropolitan area growth will bring land use “friction”

Require Lagoon Closure Requirements

Financial assurance mechanisms (e.g. Surety bonds, self-insurance)

County Health Director and County Attorney are the responsible officials

Performance Standards

Staff, training, and equipment costs due to monitoring and enforcement

Complaint-based feedback is fast for odors; too slow and too late for groundwater

Preconstruction review of designs by agricultural engineers

Many water pollution setbacks double as performance standards

Health & Environmental Standards (authority over present and future)

So long as rules are reasonably related to the stated public policy goal (e.g. air pollution reduction)

Draft ordinance by planners and staff from other departments to construct comprehensive strategy

States might preempt county authority & places demands on the technical capacity of staff

Public accessibility of comprehensive nutrient management plans as an environmental regulation